



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/729,878

12/05/2003

Todd D. Wakefield

03760.023/5140 P

9156

7590

06/12/2006

Parsons Behle & Latimer  
Suite 1800  
201 South Main Street  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

EXAMINER

CAO, PHUONG THAO

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2164

DATE MAILED: 06/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/729,878	WAKEFIELD ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Phuong-Thao Cao	2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 May 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/8/04 and 1/7/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to Application filed on 12/05/2003.
2. Claims 1-32 are pending.

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

3. The Information Disclosure Statements (IDS) filed by Applicant on 03/08/2004 and 01/07/2005 have been received and considered. Copies of the reviewed IDS(s) are enclosed with this office action.

#### ***Double Patenting***

4. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

5. Claims 1-9 and 11-32 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-16 of copending Application No. 10/729,862. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

6. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7. Claims 1-9 and 11-32 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-32 of copending Application No. 10/729,347. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-32 of the copending application teach all the limitations of claims 1-9 and 11-32 of the instant application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

8. Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 10-11, 18-22, 24 and 26 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of copending Application No. 10/729,431. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-15 of the copending application anticipate all the limitations of claims 1-4, 6, 8, 10-11, 18-22, 24 and 26 of the instant application wherein the limitation "criteria" in the copending application is equivalent to the limitation "caseframes" in the instant application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

9. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. Claims 16, 17, 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 16 recites the limitation "the identified attributes" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 17 recites the limitation "identified relational facts" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 31 recites the limitation "the identified attributes" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 32 recites the limitation "identified relation types" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Appropriate corrections are required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

12. Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gaizauskas et al. ("Information Extraction: Beyond Document Retrieval", Computational Linguistics Society of R.O.C., August 1998).

As to claim 1, Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“A computer program product located to one or more storage media devices usable to produce structured data from unstructured free text” (see Abstract and [page 17, paragraph 2]), said computer program product comprising instructions executable by a computer to perform the functions of:

“accessing a source of unstructured data, the unstructured data including free text” (see [page 17, paragraph 2] and [page 24, paragraph 2]);

“identifying text records within the free text” (see [page 17, paragraph 2] and [page 44, paragraphs 3 and 4] where the disclosure of applying domain-specific lexically-triggered patterns to identify information for extracting implies identifying corresponding patterns such as phrase or sentence within the text which is equivalent to Applicant’s “text records”; also see [page 34, paragraphs 3-6]);

“linguistically parsing the identified text records” (see [page 19, paragraph 1] and [page 44, paragraph 4] wherein a sentence or phrase from the text is equivalent to Applicant’s “text records”; also see [page 38, paragraph 2]);

“identifying roles with the parsed text records, said identifying producing attribute extractions, each of said attribute extractions containing role information of the derived source text” (see [page 21, paragraph 2] and [page 22, paragraphs 2-3]);

“applying caseframes to the attribute extractions, said applying caseframes producing a filtered set of attribute extractions” (see [page 22, paragraph 2] wherein script-driven predictions are equivalent to Applicant’s “caseframes”; also see [page 22, paragraph 3] and [page 23, paragraph 1]); and

“producing a structured data elements containing the filtered set of extractions” (see Abstract and [page 21, paragraph 1] wherein structured record is equivalent to Applicant’s “structured data element”).

As to claim 2, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“identifying domains of filtered set of attribute extractions” (see [page 21, paragraph 2] and [page 22, paragraph 1] wherein the disclosure of using sketchy scripts for sixty situations to extract information from news stories in domains ranging from earthquakes to labour strikes indicates that domains must be identified in order to use specific scripts to extract corresponding information as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language; also see [page 24, paragraph 2]).

As to claim 3, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 2 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“the assignment of domain roles” (see [page 22, paragraphs 2-3] wherein using script-driven predictions to identify actors (such as originating customer, originating bank, receiving bank, etc.) is an example of assigning domain roles; or the disclosure of “what was to be extracted were roles in particular historical events, such as...” is another example of assigning domain roles as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language).



As to claim 4, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 3 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“producing relation types” (see Abstract and [page 19, paragraph 1] wherein grammatical variation (active/passive) or lexical variation (‘named to’ vs. ‘took the helm’) are examples of relation types; also see [page 22, paragraph 3] wherein semantic relations is equivalent to Applicant’s “relation types”).

As to claim 5, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 4 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“coalescing the produced relation types” (see [page 22, paragraph 3] wherein semantic relations is equivalent to Applicant’s “relation types” and the disclosure of capturing certain semantic relations is equivalent to Applicant’s claim language; also see [page 33, paragraph 2] wherein caseframes represent different relation types).

As to claim 6, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“creating a new database containing the structured data element produced in said producing” (see Abstract, [page 17, paragraph 2], [page 33, paragraph 3] and [page 48, paragraph 7]).

As to claim 7, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“produce a new relational database containing the structured data element produced in said producing a structured data element” (see [page 52, paragraph 3] wherein conventional databases can be accessed with SQL query processors are relational databases; also see [page 21, paragraph 1]).

As to claim 8, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“producing a file containing the structured data element produced in said producing a structured data element” (see Abstract and Figure 1 wherein template is equivalent to Applicant’s “file”).

As to claim 9, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 5 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“to produce a file having format containing the structured data element selected from the group of XML, character separated values, spreadsheet formats and file-based database

structures” (see Abstract, Figure 1d , [page 21, paragraph 1], [page 43, paragraph 2], [page 48, paragraphs 6-7], [page 49, paragraph 1]).

As to claim 10, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“a processing unit coupled to said one or more storage media devices, said processing unit being capable of executing said instructions”; and

“an execution command unit, whereby operation of said instructions and said processing unit may be commanded or controlled” (see [page 17, paragraph 2], [page 31, paragraph 5] and [page 53, paragraph 2] wherein the disclosure of Information Extraction system as a computer-operated system read on Applicant’s claim language since every computer includes a processing unit and an execution command unit as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language).

As to claim 11, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“the performing of said producing includes reference information to the original free text for construed data” (see [page 17, paragraph 2] wherein the disclosure of constructing indices into the source texts implies the inclusion of reference information as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language).

As to claim 12, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“construct a library containing extracted attributes” (see [page 39, paragraphs 2-4] and [page 40 paragraphs 1-2] wherein attribute knowledge base is equivalent to Applicant’s “library containing extracted attributes”).

As to claim 13, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“construct a library containing extracted relational facts” (see [page 22, paragraph 2] wherein a template of ‘fact extraction’ system containing extracted information about company earnings and dividends is equivalent to Applicant’s “a library containing extracted relational facts”).

As to claim 14, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“combining like relation types” (see [page 42, paragraph 2] for the disclosure of merging the logical object of the naming event with the logical subject of the naming event).

As to claim 15, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“combining like attributes” (see [page 18, paragraph 3-7] and [page 19, paragraph 1] wherein to extract a fact such as disclosed from each of alternative formulations, it must include the combination of like attributes which play different roles in different sentences (1), (2) and (3)).

As to claim 16, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“coalescing the identified attributes” (see [page 22, paragraph 2] wherein identified actors as disclosed are equivalent to Applicant’s “identified attributes”, and filling in a template with identified actors is equivalent to Applicant’s claim language; also see [page 50, paragraph 1]).

As to claim 17, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“coalescing identified relational facts” (see [page 52, paragraph 3] wherein commodity price changes are equivalent to Applicant’s “identified relational facts” and building a database of these fluctuations over some historical period is equivalent to Applicant’s claim language).

As to claim 18, Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“A method for producing structured data from unstructured free text” (see Abstract and [page 17, paragraph 2]), comprising the steps of:

“accessing a source of unstructured data, the unstructured data including free text” (see [page 17, paragraph 2] and [page 24, paragraph 2]);

“identifying text records within the free text” (see [page 17, paragraph 2] and [page 44, paragraphs 3 and 4] where the disclosure of applying domain-specific lexically-triggered patterns to identify information for extracting implies identifying corresponding patterns such as phrase or sentence within the text which is equivalent to Applicant’s “text records”; also see [page 34, paragraphs 3-6]);

“parsing the identified text records” (see [page 19, paragraph 1] and [page 44, paragraph 4] wherein a sentence or phrase from the text is equivalent to Applicant’s “text records”; also see [page 38, paragraph 2]);

“identifying roles with the parsed text records, said identifying producing attribute extractions, each of said attribute extractions containing role information of the derived source text” (see [page 21, paragraph 2] and [page 22, paragraphs 2-3]);

“applying caseframes to the attribute extractions, said applying caseframes producing a filtered set of attribute extractions” (see [page 22, paragraph 2] wherein script-driven predictions are equivalent to Applicant’s “caseframes”; also see [page 22, paragraph 3] and [page 23, paragraph 1]); and

“producing a structured data elements containing the filtered set of extractions” (see Abstract and [page 21, paragraph 1] wherein structured record is equivalent to Applicant’s “structured data element”).

As to claim 19, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 18 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“identifying domains of filtered set of attribute extractions” (see [page 21, paragraph 2] and [page 22, paragraph 1] wherein the disclosure of using sketchy scripts for sixty situations to extract information from news stories in domains ranging from earthquakes to labour strikes indicates that domains must be identified in order to use specific scripts to extract corresponding information as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language; also see [page 24, paragraph 2]).

As to claim 20, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 19 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“assigning domain roles” (see [page 22, paragraphs 2-3] wherein using script-driven predictions to identify actors (such as originating customer, originating bank, receiving bank, etc.) is an example of assigning domain roles; or the disclosure of “what was to be extracted were roles in particular historical events, such as...” is another example of assigning domain roles as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language).

As to claim 21, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 20 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“producing relation types” (see Abstract and [page 19, paragraph 1] wherein grammatical variation (active/passive) or lexical variation (‘named to’ vs. ‘took the helm’) are examples of relation types; also see [page 22, paragraph 3] wherein semantic relations is equivalent to Applicant’s “relation types”).

As to claim 22, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 18 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“creating a new database containing the structured data element produced in said producing” (see Abstract, [page 17, paragraph 2], [page 33, paragraph 3] and [page 48, paragraph 7]).

As to claim 23, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 18 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“producing a new relational database containing the structured data element produced in said producing a structured data element” (see [page 52, paragraph 3] wherein conventional databases can be accessed with SQL query processors are relational databases; also see [page 21, paragraph 1]).



As to claim 24, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 18 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“producing a file containing the structured data element produced in said producing a structured data element” (see Abstract and Figure 1 wherein template is equivalent to Applicant’s “file”).

As to claim 25, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 24 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“a file is produced having a format containing the structured data element selected from the group of XML, character separated values, spreadsheet formats and file-based database structures” (see Abstract, Figure 1d , [page 21, paragraph 1], [page 43, paragraph 2], [page 48, paragraphs 6-7], [page 49, paragraph 1]).

As to claim 26, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 18 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“the performing of said producing includes reference information to the original free text for construed data” (see [page 17, paragraph 2] wherein the disclosure of constructing indices

into the source texts implies the inclusion of reference information as illustrated in Applicant's claim language).

As to claim 27, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 18 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“constructing a library containing extracted attributes” (see [page 39, paragraphs 2-4] and [page 40 paragraphs 1-2] wherein attribute knowledge base is equivalent to Applicant's “library containing extracted attributes”).

As to claim 28, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 18 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“constructing a library containing extracted relational facts” (see [page 22, paragraph 2] wherein a template of ‘fact extraction’ system containing extracted information about company earnings and dividends is equivalent to Applicant's “a library containing extracted relational facts”).

As to claim 29, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 18 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“combining like relation types” (see [page 42, paragraph 2] for the disclosure of merging the logical object of the naming event with the logical subject of the naming event).

As to claim 30, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 18 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“combining like attributes” (see [page 18, paragraph 3-7] and [page 19, paragraph 1] wherein to extract a fact such as disclosed from each of alternative formulations, it must include the combination of like attributes which play different roles in different sentences (1), (2) and (3)).

As to claim 31, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 18 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“coalescing the identified attributes” (see [page 22, paragraph 2] wherein identified actors as disclosed are equivalent to Applicant’s “identified attributes”, and filling in a template with identified actors is equivalent to Applicant’s claim language; also see [page 50, paragraph 1]).

As to claim 32, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 18 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Gaizauskas et al. teach:

“coalescing identified relation types” (see [page 22, paragraph 3] wherein semantic relations is equivalent to Applicant’s “relation types” and the disclosure of capturing certain semantic relations is equivalent to Applicant’s claim language; also see [page 33, paragraph 2] wherein caseframes represent different relation types).

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant’s disclosure.

Riloff et al. (“An Empirical Approach to Conceptual Case Frame Acquisition”, Proceedings of the Sixth Workshop on Very Large Corpora: 1998) teach a conceptual natural language processing systems relying on case frame instantiation to recognize event and role objects in text.

Riloff (“Automatically Constructing a Dictionary for Information Extraction Tasks”, Proceedings of the Eleventh National Conference on Artificial Intelligence: 1993) teach a system called AutoSlog that automatically builds a domain-specific dictionary of concepts for extracting information from text.

*Conclusion*


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong-Thao Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-2735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM (Mon - Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PTC

May 31, 2006

  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2167